UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

ANTHONY BUSSIE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:14-CV-345-JAR
)	
JOHN BOEHNER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff Anthony Bussie's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2]. Plaintiff, an inmate at the Philadelphia-FDC in Pennsylvania has filed at least three previous cases that were dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), therefore, the Court may not grant the motion unless plaintiff was "under imminent danger of

¹Although the caption of the complaint lists a second plaintiff, Taron Bussie, this individual has neither signed the complaint, nor has he paid the filing fee or submitted a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Moreover, there are no allegations in the complaint pertaining to Taron Bussie. As such, the Court will liberally construe the complaint as having been brought solely by Anthony Bussie.

²See Bussie v. Attorney General, Case No. 3:13-CV-476-WMC (W.D. Wis.); Bussie v. Federal Election Comm'n, Case No. 3:13-CV-477-WMC (W.D. Wis.); Bussie v. Federal Deposit Ins. Corp., Case No. 1:13-CV-23000-UU (S.D. Fla.); Bussie v. United States, Case No. 3:11-CV-1475-FLW (D. N.J.); Bussie v. Brauman, Case No. 3:13-CV-1055-AWT (D. Conn.).

serious physical injury" at the time the complaint was filed. See Martin v. Shelton, 319 F.3d 1048, 1050 (8th Cir. 2003) (imminent danger of serious physical injury must exist at the time the complaint is filed).

After reviewing the complaint, the Court finds no allegations indicating that plaintiff was in imminent danger of serious physical injury when he filed his complaint.³ As a result, the Court will deny the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and will dismiss this action without prejudice to refiling as a fully-paid complaint.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

³For relief, plaintiff seeks \$2.4 trillion dollars. To the extent that one can be discerned, the theme of the complaint appears to be that two United States congressmen are corrupt. Plaintiff's rambling, disjointed allegations are legally frivolous and delusional.

A separate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 27th day of February, 2014.

JOHN A. ROSS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE